DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 053 460 32 EA 003 688

AUTHOR Gunn, Cyrus L; And Others
TITLE Indiana State Annual Evaluation Report, Fiscal Year 1970 (School Year 1969-1970): Title I, ESEA.
INSTITUTION Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 60p.

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement, Achievement Gains, Community Involvement, *Compensatory Education, Delinquent Rehabilitation, *Disadvantaged Youth, *Federal Programs, Handicapped Students, Inservice Education, Parent Participation, *Program Evaluation, Remedial Mathematics, Remedial Reading Programs, Retarded Children, Standardized Tests, Teacher Aides, Teacher Education, Test Results
IDENTIFIERS *Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I, ESEA Title I, Indiana

ABSTRACT

This evaluation attempts to measure the extent and effectiveness of ESEA Title I programs designed to meet the needs of disadvantaged children and apprizes the public and the legislature of program outcomes. In keeping with USOE requirements for evaluating Title I programs, this document is constructed of (1) responses to USOE probes by questionnaire sequence, (2) applicable supplementary or background information, and (3) available related findings. Data were collected from interviews with selected personnel from the Indiana Office of the State Superintendent of Public Instruction; reaction reports from teachers, administrators, State ESEA Title I personnel, and university personnel; onsite visitations by Title I staff and university consultants; and evaluation supplement and narrative reports distributed to local educational agency Title I directors and activity directors. (Pages 16, 28-31, and 38-40 may reproduce poorly.) (EA)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED053460

TITLE I, ESEA

STATE ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT
Fiscal Year 1970
(School Year 1969-1970)

STATE OF INDIANA

OFFICE OF STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION

Richard D. Wells
State Superintendent
of Public Instruction

Gerald Carmony
Assistant Superintendent
for Administration and Finance

Prepared by: Division of Federal Projects

Cyrus L. Gunn, Director

Ardis G. Sanders, Evaluation Consultant

Frances Earp, Consultant

Phil Jackson, Consultant

EA 003 688

INDIANA ANNUAL EVALUATION REPORT, TITLE I, ESEA

FISCAL YEAR 1970

CONTENTS

		Page
I.	Basic State Statistics	1
II.	SEA Staff Visits	4
III.	Changes Made by the SEA in the Last Three Years	8
IV.	Effect upon Education Achievement	10
V.	Effect of Title I Programs	46
VI.	Additional Efforts to Help the Disadvantaged	48
VII.	Compensatory Education Brought to Nonpublic Schools	49
VIII.	Coordinated Teacher-Teacher Aide Training Programs	50
IX.	Community and Parent Involvement	55

INDIANA LEA EVALUATION REPORTS

1. Indianapolis Tutorial Reading Project

2. West Clark Community Schools Reading Project

3. Indianapolis Programmed Remedial Mathematics Project

4. East Chicago Junior Police Project

5. School City of Mishawaka Remedial Reading Project

I. Basic State statistics:

A. Total number of operating LEA's in the State 305

B. Number of LEA's participating in Title I 292

(1) during the regular school term only 81

(2) during the summer term only 25

(3) during both the regular school term and the summer term 186

C. Number of Title I programs 1,694

D. Unduplicated number of pupils who participated in Title I programs 123,827

(1) enrolled in public school 118,944

(2) enrolled in nonpublic schools 4,883

NOTE: The above do not include the four joint projects in the State or the three institutions for neglected and delinquent children.

The following are lists of Title I Instructional and Supportive programs, along with the number of LEA's participating in each type of program.

NAME OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF LEA's
Instructional	
Art	34
Business Education	4
Cultural Enrichment	80
Language Arts	107
Home Economics	6
Industrial Arts	14
Kindergarten	2
Mathematics	148

NAME OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF LEA's
Instructional Services	
Music	24
Physical Education, Recreation	75
Pre-Kindergarten	6
Reading	355
Science	27
Social Studies	28
Special Education for Handicapped (not including Speech Therapy)	83
Speech Therapy and Hearing	58
Vocational (other than Business)	8
Work Study	10
Other:	
Environment Education	6
Field Trips	6
Camping	2
	1,083
Supportive Services	
Attendance Services	20
Curriculum Materials Center Services	4
Food Services	61
Guidance/Counseling	98
Health Services (Nurse)	157
Library Services	83
Psychological Services	45

NAME OF PROGRAM	NUMBER OF LEA's
Supportive Services	
School Social Work Services	35
Transportation Services	96
Other Services	8
	607

NOTE: If a school had a program in regular school and the same program in summer school, it was counted as two programs.

II. SEA staff visits to LEA Title I projects:

Visits by the SEA staff to LEA's were of the following types: planning or development of programs: program review or operation; program evaluation; and workshops, in-service training meetings, and other conferences.

A total of 143 individual staff visits were made to schools having Title I projects during the 1970 Fiscal Year. Fourteen workshops or conferences were conducted by SEA staff during the same period.

Following is a summary of the visits, including their purposes and effects upon the development, operation, and evaluation of the local projects.

A. For planning or development: 50 School Visits--approximately 35% of the total number.

These visits were made to assist the LEA's in completing their applications, and in most cases, they were made at the request of the LEA prior to submission of the application. An SEA staff member occasionally made a visit of this kind after receiving a Title I application containing inconsistencies or mistaken applications of guidelines.

A record of each visit was placed on file.

Visits to aid in planning or developing a program helped to bring about a mutual understanding, and often a lessening, of problems confronting the LEA that was endeavoring to satisfy guideline requirements while meeting unusual educational needs of its children.

The SEA staff member was able in some instances to assist the LEA in making a new appraisal of the educational needs of its low-income children, resulting in an improved version of the original application.

Staff members brought back with them a greater knowledge of the educational needs of the LEA's and, in addition, a better understanding of the effects which any guideline changes might have on the LEA's.

B. For program review or operation: 72 School Visits--approximately 50% of the total number.

Visits for review of the project were not usually made to those LEA's which had been visited during development of the program. Since it was not possible to visit all programs in operation, very often those which were chosen had unusual characteristics or components, such as an unusually effective tutorial program or a program built around a particularly effective remedial reading technique. Programs which were not as effective or desirable were also visited, so that improvements might be made.

These visits provided the SEA with direct information concerning the use of different techniques so that the most successful ones might be used to improve other programs. They also provided an opportunity to determine whether existing guidelines and regulations were relevant to the problems facing the LEA's.

Some projects were modified so that they might better serve educational needs of the children, or so that the project would continue to meet guidelines.

Such visits also served to introduce LEA and SEA personnel to each other. Assured of the concern and interest of the SEA, the LEA felt free, perhaps more often than before, to contact the State office whenever any questions or problems arose.

C. For evaluation: 21 School Visits--approximately 15% of the total number.

A visit for the purpose of evaluation was made as the project was nearing its completion date, unless the LEA requested an earlier visit so that a continuous evaluation might be made during the school year. Such visits were initiated by both SEA and LEA concerning evaluation procedures

and results, with priority usually given either to those LEA's displaying unusually effective projects or to those having unusual difficulty assessing their programs.

These visits usually resulted in excellent evaluation reports, since the SEA gained a more thorough and personal knowledge of the program and the LEA gained a better understanding of evaluation requirements of the SEA.

After such visits, it was often possible for the LEA, for use in developing future programs, to assess factors other than those measured in the valuation report to the SEA. This might include assessment of planning procedures, use of the staff, and relevance of the program to the needs of the children concerned.

In visiting programs which were proving to be effective, the SEA became acquainted with the rationale of the LEA in developing the program and could then assist LEA's with less successful programs to overcome weaknesses within their projects.

D. Workshops, conferences, and in-service training programs: 14 group meetings. These 14 meetings included the following:

(1) In-service training sessions at LEA's. These concerned the use of teacher aides.

(2) Area workshops. Among other subjects, these concerned the use of aides, and interpretation of guidelines, accountability, and comparability.

(3) Conferences on comparability.

(4) Follow-Through Workshop.

(5) Evaluation Workshop.

Although the SEA conducted these workshops and conferences, various LEA staff presented successful techniques and procedures used in Title I projects which they had developed.

One very profitable result of such conferences, aside from the original purpose of providing information covering a special area, was that they afforded an opportunity for dissemination of information on a variety of other subjects.

Workshops and conferences, for whatever reason they were held, gave the LEA's in attendance an opportunity to ask specific questions relating to their own programs, thus often avoiding mistakes or delays in planning programs or in making applications.

At such meetings, also, the SEA learned more about the kinds of information most often requested by the LEA's. Better procedures were then developed to answer questions from the LEA's and thereby assist them in handling their problems.

III. Changes made by the SEA in the last three years:

A. Changes made to improve the quality of Title I projects:

(1) All Title I projects are referred to curricular and other appropriate specialists for review. A report on their quality is made to the Title I office. Also, these specialists are made knowledgeable of the Title I aspects of their speciality and are expected to work with the LEA's to improve the appropriate components of Title I projects. This procedure has had the effect of improving the quality of the planning, operation, and evaluation of Title I projects.

(2) LEA's have been encouraged to reduce the number of target schools in order to concentrate Title I funds on fewer educationally disadvantaged children. This procedure has had the effect of increasing the impact of the Title I program in terms of the amount of money available for each eligible child.

(3) An increase in the size of the Title I staff has permitted better coverage of the State for the monitoring of Title I programs. Schedules for visits have been developed, as well as a reporting system for the recording of the results of program reviews.

(4) Through workshops and visits to Title I programs, the sophistication with which Title I programs have been developed has been increased, resulting in better quality programs.

(5) Librarians and library aides have been eliminated from Title I programs because program reviews revealed that, for the most part, these were being used in a general manner rather than concentrating on Title I children. The effect has been to release these funds for other components of a Title I project. Many LEA's have continued librarians and library aides with State and local funds.

B. Changes made to insure proper participation of nonpublic school children:

(1) The SEA has insisted upon the involvement of nonpublic schools in the planning, operation, and evaluation of Title I projects in accordance with OE guidelines. This is not a change in procedure but rather one of emphasis.

(2) In program reviews, nonpublic schools are visited as well as the public schools in order that programs provided in those schools by the LEA might be observed.

(3) Evaluation of the effectiveness of Title I programs extended into nonpublic schools has been made the responsibility of both the LEA and the nonpublic schools. The effect has been to increase the awareness of teachers, both in the LEA and in the nonpublic schools, of the educationally disadvantaged child in the nonpublic school.

C. Changes made to modify local projects in the light of State and local evaluation:

(1) Workshops on the techniques of evaluation have been conducted so that the objectives are more clearly stated and measured and the modification of programs based upon the above can be made.

(2) There has been considerable encouragement of continuous evaluation and changes in techniques and programs, as well as the establishment of basic line data for terminal evaluation.

(3) Through workshops and inclusion of evaluation costs in Title I programs, an increase in sophistication of evaluation techniques has been experienced on both the local and State levels.

IV. Effect upon Education Achievement:

Various testing, survey and research procedures are used to determine the continued progress of the Title I ESEA projects in Indiana. The results from the objective and subjective methods tend to provide a complete picture for total evaluation. This report is confined to the objective data in the reading area based upon standardized testing results in cooperation with the participating local school systems, public and private.

Comprehensive evaluation is a vital part of the program. Both pre- and post-testing are administered by certified reading specialists. The objective results serve as a diagnostic teaching tool as well as providing an accurate method of evaluation.

Proper testing procedures are used throughout the program under the direction of professional personnel to assure complete realiability and validity. Indiana testing norms are established by the norms used in the various testing instruments. Local norms are often established by the local school districts.

To gain a composite evaluation, five regions are designated as "target areas." These target areas represent a cross section sampling of the State's projects, and an analysis of these samplings gives an accurate objective status evaluation.

A. Reading data Title I project

State Evaluation Target Area #1

This section of the reading evaluation is an analysis of the standardized testing results representing the one area of the state. This report is composed of a sampling which accurately reflect the area's progress based upon objective instruments. The area's sampling involves approximately 1,946 students participating in Title I programs. The evaluation was based upon pre- and post-tests results from The Metropolitan Elementary Reading Test, The Stanford Diagnostic Test, The Metropolitan Achievement Test, and basal textbook objective tests results.

SUMMARY OF DATA

I. RESULTS OF METROPOLITAN ELEMENTARY READING TEST

Length of Exposure: 7 Months

		Pre-Test Mean		Post-Test Mean	Mean Gain
Grade 4	N=13	2.9	N=10	3.6	+.7
Grade 5	N=21	2.7	N=17	3.7	+1.0
Grade 6	N=11	2.4	N=5	4.0	1.6

II. RESULTS OF STANFORD DIAGNOSTIC TEST

Length of Exposure: 8 Months

		Pre-Test Mean		Post-Test Mean	Mean Gain
Grade 4	N=225	2.3	N=198	2.9	.6
Grade 5	N=234	2.9	N=207	3.5	.6
Grade 6	N=190	3.2	N=168	3.7	.5

II. GINN I TEST SCORE RESULTS

Pre-test

Test	Means Exp.	Means Cont.	Diff.	t Score	p	% Chance* Scores Exp.	% Chance* Scores Cont.	Chance** Scores	Total Possible
N	100	39							
Metropolitan Reading Readiness (1-4)	19.3	19.8	-0.5	0.3	N.S.	51.0	51.3		
Alphabet	4.3	4.2	0.1	0.1	N.S.				
Ginn Recall	0.4	0.9	-0.5	1.3	N.S.				

Post-test

N	100	39							
Alphabet	22.8	16.7	6.1	3.3	.01				
G[illegible] Recall	11.0	6.1	4.9	5.6	.001				
Pre-primer	24.5	18.4	6.1	4.4	.001	1.0	15.4	9	36
Primer	47.8	33.1	14.7	4.9	.001	3.0	30.8	21	75
First Reader	54.6	40.4	14.2	4.5	.001	12.0	23.1	29	105
Pre-primer + Primer Total	72.3	51.6	20.7	5.1	.001	1.0	15.4	30	111
Pre-primer, Primer, and First Reader Total	126.8	92.0	34.8	5.1	.001	1.0	15.4	59	216
Metropolitan Achievement Test Total (1-4)	83.8	64.6	19.2	3.7	.001				

* "% Chance Scores" is the number of subjects whose score is less than or equal to that score which would be obtained if every question had been answered by guessing divided by the number of subjects in the group.

** "Chance Score" is that score which would be obtained (in the "long run") if every question had been answered by guessing only; e.g., for a 100 question test, each question with four alternatives, the chance score would be 25.

III. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY RESULTS

	Pretest			Posttest		
	Exper.	Control	Mean Diff.	Exper.	Control	Mean Diff.
Metropolitan.	19.32	19.79	- .47	83.83	64.64	19.19
Ginn Recall	.38	.90	- .52	10.96	6.08	4.88
Alphabet.	4.25	4.18	.07	22.76	16.69	6.07
Ginn Pre-Primer				24.50	18.44	6.06
Ginn Primer				47.77	33.13	14.64
Ginn First Reader				54.57	40.44	14.13
Ginn Pre-Primer and Primer Total Score. . . .				72.27	51.56	20.71
Ginn Pre-Primer, Primer, and First Reader Total Score				126.84	92	34.84

N=100 for Experimental Group
N=33 for Control Group

CONCLUSION

In light of the stated objectives the evaluation data does tend to indicate successful results. These reading surveys show that, provided the opportunity, the deprived child can show significant progress. These positive results are reflected by gains made by participating pupils in the reading skills in vocabulary and comprehension.

State Evaluation Target Area #2

This part of the reading evaluation contains the results of sampling from the second representative area of the state. Approximately 1,242 tests results were studied for this portion of the evaluation.

SUMMARY OF DATA

I. The data listed below shows a comparison of ending first grade percentile scores on the Metropolitan Achievement Test of tutored children from target area schools, post-matched with untutored children from non-target schools, by identical readiness scores in September 1969. The significant difference in achievement is graphically illustrated for comparison. The tutored group scored from 37.8% to 108% above the non-tutored group. The percentile improvements per matched readiness percentiles were as follows:

Met. Readiness Mean Percentile	Met. Achievement Mean Percentile NON-TUTORED	Met. Achievement Mean Percentile TUTORED	Percent of Improvement
3	22.2	47.6	53.3
11	21.5	51.0	57.8
13	54.7	75.4	37.8
17	23.5	38.9	65.5
20	37.5	61.0	62.6
25	36.7	76.4	108.0
39.6	39.6	69.6	75.7

II. METROPOLITAN READINESS PERCENTILE SCORES, SEPTEMBER, 1969, IN COMPARISON WITH METROPOLITAN ACHIEVEMENT SCORES, MAY, 1970

Percentiles	Achievement Scores			Totals
	1.0-1.4	1.5-1.9	2.0+	
31 or above		18	9	27
26 to 30		8	12	20
21 to 25	2	7	4	13
16 to 20	4	18	11	33
11 to 15	4	17	7	28
6 to 10	4	32	5	41
0 to 5	13	37	8	58
Totals	27	137	56	220

III. The following data presents a comparison of tutored students' percentile scores on the Metropolitan Readiness Test with the mean grade achievement scores on the Reading sub-tests of the Metropolitan Achievement. Tests were administered to first grade students in May, 1970, at the end of first grade. The percentile score gains of the ending Metropolitan Achievement compared to the beginning percentile scores on the Metropolitan Readiness are further shown according to schools in the listing below.

Survey Groups	Metropolitan Readiness Percentile Mean - Sept., 1969	Metropolitan Achievement Percentile Mean May, 1970	Mean Percentile Gain
Group A	12.9	72.6	59.7
Group B	12.7	39.5	26.8
Group C	13.0	44.5	31.5
Group D	12.0	46.0	36.0
Group E	8.0	37.3	29.3
Group F	10.8	33.6	22.8
Group G	18.6	32.3	13.7

IV. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

MEAN PRETEST AND POSTTEST GATES-MacGINITIE READING TEST SCORES OF REMEDIAL READING STUDENTS BY GRADES (REGULAR SCHOOL YEAR)

Grade	Number of Students	Mean IQ*	Mean Reading Score (September)	Mean Reading Score (May)
2	141	88.9	1.2	2.2
3	185	91.3	1.7	2.7
4	153	86.6	2.3	3.0
5	170	89.1	3.0	4.0
6	120	91.0	3.6	4.5
7	75	86.5	4.3	5.0
8	40	89.3	4.5	5.6
TOTAL	884	89.1	2.6	3.5

From school record or Peabody Picture Vocabulary Test

V. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test B	1	2	2nd

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
_x_ Special Remedial Teacher
_x_ Reading Consultant
_x_ Teacher Aides
_x_ Summer Remedial Reading
_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
September 1969	171	May 1970	168
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
1.3		2.2	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
Not available							

e of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test C	1	2	3rd

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
_x_ Special Remedial Teacher
_x_ Reading Consultant
_x_ Teacher Aides
_x_ Summer Remedial Reading
_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
September 1969	125	May 1970	121
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
2.0		3.1	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
Not available							

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test	D-1M	D-3M	4th

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
x Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
September 1969	135	May 1970	137
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
2.7		3.7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
Not available							

ne of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates MacGinitie Reading Test	D-1M	D-3M	5th

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
x Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
May 1969	45	May 1970	46
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
3.3		4.4	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
Not available							

VI. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

The Gates-MacGinitie Reading Test

Grade	# of Pupils	Pre-test Mean Grade	Post-test Mean Grade
2	171	1.3	2.2
3	125	2.0	3.1
4	137	2.7	3.7
5	46	3.3	4.4

CONCLUSION

The results in the various objective surveys tend to indicate reading improvement by those children participating in the Title I Project. The standardized tests results compared the ending first grade percentile scores of tutored children from target area schools, post-matched with untutored children from non-target schools, by identical readiness scores. The results of this survey reflected the general degree of other surveys in this target area. The tutored group scored from 37.8% to 108% above the non-tutored group.

State Evaluation Target Area #3

A total of approximately 2,897 participating children's tests results were examined in this Title I target area. Various grade levels were given pre- and post-testing in reading and basic achievement skills to provide an accurate and objective study.

SUMMARY OF DATA

I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

MEAN AND MEDIAN SCORES OF IOWA TEST OF BASIC SKILLS PARTS A AND B GIVEN IN TARGET PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN GRADES 4 and 6 COMPARED TO LOCAL AND NATIONAL NORMS

	Vocabulary		Reading Comprehension		Vocabulary		Reading Comprehension	
	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median	Mean	Median
Group 1	3.3	3.2	3.7	3.55	5.0	5.2	4.9	4.8
Group 2	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.55	5.2	5.2	5.3	5.15
Group 3	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.0	5.7	5.8	5.5	5.2
Group 4	4.0	4.0	4.1	4.1	5.6	5.6	5.7	5.6
Group 5	3.9	4.0	3.9	4.0	5.3	5.4	5.2	5.1
Group 6	3.4	3.3	3.5	3.25	5.2	5.1	5.3	5.1
Group 7	4.0	4.3	4.1	4.0	5.9	6.0	5.6	5.5
Group 8	3.7	3.6	4.0	4.1	5.6	5.8	5.5	5.55
Group 9	4.3	4.1	3.8	3.8	4.8	4.85	4.7	4.8
Group 10	4.2	4.05	4.3	4.3	6.2	6.4	5.6	5.6
Group 11	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.85
Group 12	3.0	2.6	3.0	2.6	4.5	4.7	4.6	4.4
Target	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	5.5	5.4	5.4	5.4
Local	4.4	4.6	4.5	4.4	6.3	6.5	6.1	6.2
National	4.8	4.8	4.8	4.8	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.7

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	4 Part A (Vocabulary)		4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
___ Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
___ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
April, 1970	762		
Mean Grade Equivalent 4.4		Mean Grade Equivalent	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms		Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms	
Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th		Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th	
342 / 228 / 132 / 60			

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	4 Part B (Reading Comp.)		4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
___ Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
___ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
April, 1970	762		
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.8		Mean Grade Equivalent	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms		Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms	
Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th		Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th	
370 / 214 / 107 / 71			

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	4 Part A (Vocabulary)		6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___	None Provided	___	Summer Remedial Reading
x	Special Remedial Teacher	x	Special Reading Materials
___	Reading Consultant	___	Expanded Library Facilities
x	Teacher Aides	___	Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March, 1970	673		
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
5.5			

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
349	173	105	46				

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Test of Basic Skills	4 Part B (Reading Comp.)		

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___	None Provided	___	Summer Remedial Reading
x	Special Remedial Teacher	x	Special Reading Materials
___	Reading Consultant	___	Expanded Library Facilities
x	Teacher Aides	___	Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March, 1970	687		
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
6.1			

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
394	174	95	24				

CONCLUSION

In the evaluation analysis the tests results, particularly in the concentrated reading projects, indicated growth considerably beyond that which might otherwise have been expected. The local norms of the participating schools compared favorably with the national norms. These comparisons showed reading improvement with gains in vocabulary and comprehension skills.

State Evaluation Target Area #4

This evaluation area compares the results of the post-tests to the results of the pre-tests. Grades one through seven are included in an objective study of reading comprehension and vocabulary development. Approximately 3,590 tests results represent a composite picture of this state evaluation target area.

SUMMARY OF DATA

I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	Grade 1

Group 1

Test Results 13.53	
Date of Test April 1970	Number of Pupils 882
Mean Grade Equivalent 1-8	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms

Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
251	277	205	149

Group 2

Test Results 10.95	
Date of Test April 1970	Number of Pupils 882
ean Grade Equivalent 1-9	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms

Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
210	277	212	183

II. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	2

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Reading Consultant	_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
_x_ Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
13.08		22.91	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March, 1969	731	April, 1970	1,012
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
1-7		2-7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
202	242	155	132	273	342	223	174

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	2

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Reading Consultant	_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
_x_ Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
11.10		18.68	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March, 1969	731	April, 1970	1,012
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
1-9		3-4	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
163	231	173	164	260	323	243	186

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	3

e of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
23.59		26.81	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	832	April 1970	987
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
2-8		3-3	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
212	275	215	130	286	281	196	224

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	3

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
18.55		18.53	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	832	April 1970	987
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
3-4		3-4	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
273	263	178	118	338	317	117	215

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
___ Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
29.5		17.4	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1979	693	April 1970	765
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
3-9		4-7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
198	136	207	152	239	150	203	173

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
___ Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
20.5		15.9	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	691	April 1970	765
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
3-7		4-8	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
184	189	175	143	195	200	193	177

V. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade 5
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	Low - Average

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
___ Special Remedial Teacher
_x_ Reading Consultant
_x_ Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
17.3		21.1	
Date of Test: March 1969	Number of Pupils: 847	Date of Test: April 1970	Number of Pupils: 964
Mean Grade Equivalent: 4-6		Mean Grade Equivalent: 5-6	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Total Gd. 5				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Total Gd. 5			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
201	278	209	184	225	286	230	262

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade 5
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	Low - Average

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
___ Special Remedial Teacher
_x_ Reading Consultant
_x_ Teacher Aides
___ Summer Remedial Reading
_x_ Special Reading Materials
_x_ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
15		20.8	
Date of Test: March 1969	Number of Pupils: 844	Date of Test: April 1970	Number of Pupils: 963
Mean Grade Equivalent: 4-7		Mean Grade Equivalent: 5-7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
233	217	225	191	257	235	248	252

VI. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Green)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	5 Advanced

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

____ None Provided
____ Special Remedial Teacher
__x__ Reading Consultant
__x__ Teacher Aides
____ Summer Remedial Reading
__x__ Special Reading Materials
__x__ Expanded Library Facilities
____ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
21.6		21.4	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	25	April 1970	27
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
5-7		6-9	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Green)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	5 Advanced

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

____ None Provided
____ Special Remedial Teacher
__x__ Reading Consultant
__x__ Teacher Aides
____ Summer Remedial Reading
__x__ Special Reading Materials
__x__ Expanded Library Facilities
____ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
24.3		26.1	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	25	April 1970	27
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
6-4		7-7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th

VII. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	6 Low

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
___ Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
14.6		17.4	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	265	April 1970	311
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
4-0		4-7	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Total Grade 6				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Grade 6 Total			
below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
235	193	274	210	275	225	288	274

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Blue)	Grade
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	6 Low

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
___ Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
13.5		16.5	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	263	April 1970	331
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
4-1		4-9	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Total Grade 6				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms Total Grade 6			
Low 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
245	252	276	179	281	274	252	275

VIII. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Green)	Grade Average to Advanced
SRA Achievement Series Reading Comprehension	D	D	

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
23.5		22.2	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	642	April 1970	751
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
6-2		7-2	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms		Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms	
Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th		Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th	

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test (Blue)	Form Post-Test (Green)	Grade Average to Advanced
SRA Achievement Series Reading Vocabulary	D	D	

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library facilities
x Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
24		24.1	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
March 1969	641	April 1970	751
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
6-3		7-4	
Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms		Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms	
Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th		Below 25th / 26th-50th / 51st-75th / 76th-99th	

CONCLUSION

This extensive study of 3,590 children participating in the Title I program consisted of varying levels of instruction at each grade level. The reading scores are an indication of the success of the program. At every grade level the reading scores improved and other reading content programs showed an improved record of performance.

State Evaluation Target Area #5

In this target area approximately 9,195 children were included in the objective analysis to determine the progress under the Title I project. The data indicates the grade levels examined in the pre- and post-testing.

SUMMARY OF DATA

I. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test Pre	Gates-MacGinitie	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-test	Grade
Post	"	Pre-reading	A - Z	1

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
None	60	5-70	60
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
Non-reader		1.61	

II. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test Pre	Gates-MacGinitie	Form Pre-Test	Form Post Test	Grade
Post	"	For B 1	B 2	2

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
9-69	43	5-70	43
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
1.37		2.39	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
28	13	2	0	22	16	5	0

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Clymer-Barrett Pre-reading Battery	A		Kindergarten

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
___ Special Remedial Teacher
___ Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
x Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
___ Expanded Library Facilities
x Other, (specify) oral language, visual-motor skills

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
May 11-15, 1970	1,384		

Mean Grade Equivalent	Mean Grade Equivalent
No norms for G.E.	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
83	119	303	879				
264	235	268	617				

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Metropolitan Readiness Tests	A		1

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
___ Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
x Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
x Other, (specify) oral language

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
Sept. 8, 1970	1,774		

Mean Grade Equivalent	Mean Grade Equivalent
No norms for G.E.	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms					Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
E	D	C	B	A	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
36	284	727	532	195				
7	24	38	24	7 = 100% (Nat'l Norms)				
2	16	41	30	11 = 100% (Local Norms)				

V. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	3		6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

x None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	___ Special Reading Materials
___ Reading Consultant	___ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
October 1969	1,559		
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
5.08			

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
833	407	217	92				

me of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
___ Special Remedial Teacher	___ Special Reading Materials
___ Reading Consultant	___ Expanded Library Facilities
___ Teacher Aides	___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Metropolitan Upper Primary	B		2

e of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

- x None Provided
- ___ Special Remedial Teacher
- ___ Reading Consultant
- ___ Teacher Aides
- ___ Summer Remedial Reading
- ___ Special Reading Materials
- ___ Expanded Library Facilities
- ___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
February 24, 1970	1,512		
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
2.69			

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
503	379	224	407				

ime of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Iowa Tests of Basic Skills	3		4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

- x None Provided
- ___ Special Remedial Teacher
- ___ Reading Consultant
- ___ Teacher Aides
- ___ Summer Remedial Reading
- ___ Special Reading Materials
- ___ Expanded Library Facilities
- ___ Other, (specify) _____

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
October 1969	1,444		
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
3.33			

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
598	551	219	78				

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates-MacGinitie	D3	D2	4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	x Other, (specify) Counseling

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
9-69	62	5-70	62
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
2.83		3.71	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
47	14	1	0	35	22	5	0

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post-Test	Grade
Gates-MacGinitie	C 1	C 2	3

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

___ None Provided	___ Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Remedial Teacher	x Special Reading Materials
x Reading Consultant	x Expanded Library Facilities
x Teacher Aides	x Other, (specify) Counseling

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test	Number of Pupils	Date of Test	Number of Pupils
9-69	51	5-70	51
Mean Grade Equivalent		Mean Grade Equivalent	
1.98		2.72	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th	Below 25th	26th-50th	51st-75th	76th-99th
40	10	0	0	31	17	2	0

PAROCHIAL

VII. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-Test D 3	Form Post Test D 2	Grade 4

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 17	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 17
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.38		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.78	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
5	11	1	0	0	14	3	0

Name of Test Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	Form Pre-test C 1	Form Post-test C 2	Grade 3

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities
__Other, (Specify)

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 10	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 10
Mean Grade Equivalent 2.01		Mean Grade Equivalent 3.85	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
8	2	0	0		4	4	0

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post Test	Grade
Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	D3	D2	6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
X Counseling
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 31	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 31
Mean Grade Equivalent 4.44		Mean Grade Equivalent 5.77	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
24	7	0	0	12	16	3	0

Name of Test	Form Pre-test	Form Post-test	Grade
Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	D-3	D-2	5

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
x Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
x Expanded Library Facilities
x Other, (Specify)
Counseling

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 46	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 46
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.44		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.64	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
38	8	0	0	20	19	7	0

PAROCHIAL IX. OBJECTIVE SURVEY

Name of Test	Form Pre-Test	Form Post Test	Grade
Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	D 3	D 2	6

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities,

Pre-Test Results		Post-Test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 11	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 11
Mean Grade Equivalent 4.21		Mean Grade Equivalent 5.87	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norm			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
8	3	0	0	4	4	3	0

Name of Test	Form Pre-test	Form Post-test	Grade
Pre Gates-MacGinitie Post "	D 3	D 2	5

Type of Title I Reading Activity (check as many as apply)

__Non provided
x Special Remedial Teacher
x Reading Consultant
__Teacher Aides
__Summer Remedial Reading
x Special Reading Materials
__Expanded Library Facilities
__Other, (Specify)

Pre-test Results		Post-test Results	
Date of Test 9-69	Number of Pupils 13	Date of Test 5-70	Number of Pupils 13
Mean Grade Equivalent 3.50		Mean Grade Equivalent 4.91	

Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms				Number of Pupils by Percentile Categories National Norms			
Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th	Below 25	26-50th	51-75th	76-99th
9	4	0	0	6	5	2	0

CONCLUSION

The amount of data provided in this sampling indicates the extensiveness of the objective study for this target area. These figures establish local reading percentiles and provide a means to indicate the level of achievement at each elementary grade level. The post-tests results indicate that the children did benefit by reflecting a significant academic mean gain.

B. Characteristics exhibited in successful Title I projects:

(1) There is a working relationship with a responsible advisory council which has assessed the needs of the educationally deprived segment of the community, making possible a more realistic evaluation of needs and concerns.

(2) Parents have a strong interest in programs assisting the underpriviliged child. This results in improved student attendance, and often in improved appearance of the children themselves. When parents are interested in their children's progress in Title I programs, they usually make themselves available for consultation and will give school personnel any assistance possible.

Such parental involvement has not come into being without development of a positive attitude on the part of the administrators in the State. As a result greater enthusiasm has been generated among administrators and teachers to work with parents on Title I projects.

(3) Information concerning progress of the program as a whole is made available to the public, and individual progress of students is reported to those having a direct and personal interest in the program. The public, particularly the parents, gain knowledge of LEA efforts to provide special educational assistance in the following ways:

(a) Information indicating the progress and success of Title I programs is made public through local newspapers, schools newspapers, and letters.

(b) A special effort is made to inform parents of the progress of their children either by personal contact, by letter, or by telephone.

(4) Data is gathered to determine program validity and, if necessary, possible modification or deletion.

(a) Successful components are validated with statistics.

(b) Unsuccessful program components have appropriate data so that the problem may be defined and studied.

(c) Adequate evaluation is applied to all programs and data in order to determine revelancy.

(5) Thorough in-service training is provided for both the administrative staff and the instructional staff.

(a) The in-service section of the application of a successful Title I project indicates a well-planned program of continued training at predetermined times, covering specific subject areas.

(b) Through periodic project reviews, staff members of an effective Title I project are constantly reminded of the objectives of their segment of the program. During such reviews, the staff also discusses whether or not the work they are doing is making progress. If it is not accomplishing its objectives, they will then consider an early revision of the project.

(6) Eligible children are identified by name on the basis of the criteria on page 1, item 4, of the application. Any additional participants are identified according to individual need and also by name.

(a) The children identified by criteria on page 1, item 4, of the application are named by the project director and the Title I staff involved. Supportive data are available to substantiate the total number of deprived. This listing and information is confidential information.

(b) Generally the target school areas do not include all the children identified on page 1, item 4, of the application. Therefore, the number served will be less than the total indicated on page 1, item 4.

(c) If children who do not qualify on an economically or educationally deprived basis are included, an appropriate rationale is given to support their participation.

(7) The project is concentrated on those students demonstrating the greatest need. The program is built around those needs and designed to meet the many needs of the concentrated number, rather than expanded to include additional students on a more narrow range of needs.

(a) The deprived students identified as participants are known personnally by staff members.

(b) The relationship is such that proper assessment of the academic and social deficiencies can be determined.

(c) The needs of the most needy are provided for before additional students are added to the program.

C. Evidence of effectiveness of projects related to cost:

There is no hard evidence that the effectiveness of Title I projects is related to costs on a State basis. However, evidence provided by some of the LEA's shows conclusive improvement in the performance of target area children in various curricular areas and it may be assumed that this improvement is the result of the expenditure of Title I dollars. But to assign a specific dollar value to improvement or lack of improvement in all projects in the State would be a very difficult proposition and would

be of doubtful validity and reliability with our present technical capabilities.

In general, it is felt that additional money spent upon each Title I child, given comparability, is resulting in the improvement of the educational lot of these children whether or not the cost-effect relationship can be quantified at this juncture in the program.

V. Effect of Title I programs on administrative structure and educational practices of SEA, LEA, and nonpublic schools:

A. SEA - On the State level, the Title I program has been separated from the Equal Educational Opportunity (Title IV) program, formerly the Community Relations Division, and placed in the Federal Projects Division under the Director of the Federal Projects Division, who is responsible for the coordination of Title I programs. This division is responsible to the Assistant Superintendent for Administration and Finance. Also, the Title I staff of consultants has been augmented, although not sufficiently to perform all of the activities necessary to accelerate improvement in the quality of the Title I programs.

More effective use of the curriculum specialists in the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction has been accomplished through the routing of applications to these specialists for comment and visitation. More effort has been made to coordinate with other federal programs targeted upon the educationally disadvantaged in the areas of special education, vocational education, and teacher training.

B. LEA - In most LEA's the duty of organization, planning, coordinating, administering, and evaluating Title I programs has been given to a special staff member to provide greater concentration of effort on Title I.

At this stage in the development of Title I, less emphasis is being placed upon materials and equipment and more upon programs. In some LEA's more supportive services are being included in their Title I programs, while in others these services are being provided through local effort and Title I funds are concentrated on educational activities, particularly reading. In this area greater program sophistication is noted.

While several LEA's have had a high degree of parental participation in their Title I programs in the past, and others to a lesser extent, plans are being made by most LEA's to increase parental participation in the administrative mechanism of their program.

C. Nonpublic schools- There is no evidence that Title I has changed the administrative structure of nonpublic schools except that in most LEA's where nonpublic schools are located, nonpublic school personnel is consulted in the development and operation of those elements of the Title I program which are to be extended into the nonpublic schools.

VI. Additional efforts to help the disadvantaged:

A. No State funds have been appropriated specifically for compensatory education programs except for Special Education for the handicapped. These funds are distributed to LEA's which conduct Special Education classes on a pro-rata excess cost formula basis. During the 1969-70 school year, State funds in the amount of $4,373,394.80 were distributed to LEA's to support Special Education classes for 59,442 handicapped children. The total cost of the Indiana Special Education program was $18,876,600.00.

B. An outstanding example of the coordination of Title I funds with other federally funded programs is that of the M.S.D. of Wayne Township Joint Services and Supply Project. This project for seriously handicapped children involves the joint efforts of 10 school corporations located west of Indianapolis. In addition to Title I funds, funds from the following federal sources are used in the project: Title II ESEA, Title III ESEA, Title VI ESEA, Basic Adult Education, Vocational Rehabilitation, School Lunch, and Vocational Education.

Practically every Indiana LEA uses other federally funded programs in connection with their Title I projects, though these funds are not specifically set out in the Title I projects except in the part of the program description concerning coordination with other federally funded programs. The other federally funded programs most often mentioned in the program descriptions are the following: Title II ESEA, Title III NDEA, School Lunch, and Vocational Education.

VII. Compensatory education brought to nonpublic schools through Title I:

Public and nonpublic school cooperation in regard to Title I projects in Indiana has been excellent. In all corporations having nonpublic schools, the authorized LEA Title I representative or director conferred with officials of nonpublic schools in regard to project planning, implementation, and evaluation.

The SEA emphasized by personal discussions and by written communications that nonpublic officials should be involved early in Title I program planning. When reviewing an application submitted from a project area in which nonpublic schools were located, the SEA made certain that nonpublic school officials had been given the opportunity to participate if they so desired.

In Indiana 4,883 pupils from 59 nonpublic schools participated in Title I projects. These were instructional and supportive projects: mainly reading, mathematics, language arts, psychological and testing services, and health and guidance.

The nonpublic school pupils attended both regular term and summer classes in the public schools. These classes were held during daytime school hours. Occasionally, because of special needs, instructional and supportive services were conducted in nonpublic schools.

Data on pre- and post-achievement testing were collected as an aggregate and not separately reported for public and nonpublic school children.

Participation or nonparticipation of nonpublic school children Title I projects has never been challenged. There has been no litigation, nor has there been any reason for new or revised legal interpretation.

In regard to joint planning of a Title I project, public and nonpublic schools of a target area have cooperated to include in the project those components which would be most helpful in solving problems common to both systems. This has resulted in very effective Title I programs.

VIII. Coordinated teacher-teacher aide training programs conducted by LEA's:

According to the Title I applications and evaluations, nearly all LEA's having Title I projects conducted in-service training. The extent of this training depended largely on the size of the program, the number of people involved, and the experience of the staff. The number of participants in these training programs totaled 6,740.

The general pattern of activities consisted of meetings prior to the beginning of the Title I programs with emphasis on familiarization with audio-visual materials, production of instructional materials, and staff orientation of LEA philosophy and procedures. Most of these sessions were conducted by consultants and administrative staff at the local level.

More extensive training programs took two or three weeks and were conducted by a staff of experts from Indiana universities. Some LEA's sent their staff to workshops of other LEA's or to those in neighboring states.

It is generally believed by most LEA's that in-service training is a continuous process and meetings are held regularly (once or twice a week) to share experiences and methods of handling current problems.

The SEA has provided guidance for the LEA's in staff training. Six panel discussion meetings were conducted by the SEA in various parts of the State last year. State Title I staff members are frequently asked to participate in the LEA's in-service training meetings and to address teachers and parents at their meetings.

The following Volunteer Teacher Aide program is an example of an effective and well-planned Title I teacher - teacher aide training program. This plan of selecting and training teacher aides has been developed by the Metropolitan School District of Decatur Township, Marion County, Indiana. Excellent training materials and guides have been prepared for the Volunteer Teacher Aides to use in their work with Title I children.

METROPOLITAN SCHOOL DISTRICT OF DECATUR TOWNSHIP

IN-SERVICE TRAINING FOR VOLUNTEERS

Aide Program Under Title I

A. Selection and recruitment of Volunteer Teacher Aides:

- Volunteer Aides may have a wide background of education, ranging from very little high school work to college graduation. They may also be of any age, from young adults to people of middle age to retirement. Both men and women are involved.

Any individual interested in assisting pupils by serving as a Volunteer Teacher Aide is instructed to contact the Title I Coordinator. The Title I Coordinator receives Volunteers through the following contacts:

(1) Patrons who call a school principal and indicate willingness to help.

(2) Patrons who are contacted by the principal or other school personnel to serve as members of the Volunteers.

(3) Parents of disadvantaged pupils who are enrolled in the program.

(4) Individuals who make inquiry in response to local newspaper articles written about the Volunteer Aide Program. Additional information is carried in the school corporation bulletin that goes to all taxpayers.

(5) Individuals who respond to publicity and public relations by P.T.A. organizations. Churches and community service clubs assist in giving information about the program.

B. Placement and training of Volunteer Teacher Aides:

Each Volunteer indicates a preferance for an elementary building and is then assigned in that building to the classroom teacher who has requested the services of a Volunteer Aide. Through cooperative planning, the Title I

Coordinator and the Principal plan the placement of Volunteer Teacher Aides to best meet the needs of pupils within each building.

Initial in-service sessions consisting of approximately 12 hours of instruction per Aide are arranged for small groups, or they may be held on an individual basis for each building. Demonstrations and return practice demonstrations instruct the Aide in basic procedures and in the use of language masters, tape recorders with listening stations, record players, film strip projectors, overhead projectors, and any other specific equipment that might be used in the instruction. These sessions are scheduled for 2 or 3-hour periods and for as many times as are necessary to accommodate the Volunteers.

Specific additional instruction periods of 4 to 6 hours each are given those Aides who are to assist pupils in motor perceptual activities. On-going instruction for the Teacher Aide is available through the Title I Coordinator at the request of the Volunteer Aide, the Principal or the classroom teachers.

The Volunteer Aides report to their assigned building on a prearranged regularly scheduled basis depending upon the time they are available. As an example, Volunteer Aide Mrs. Martin might report to classroom teacher Mr. Jones for the purpose of helping Terry X. with his schoolwork, from 9:30 to 10:30 on Monday of each week. The classroom teacher will determine what activity or extra practice Terry might need and will prepare any materials needed, placing instructions in a centrally located file box for Volunteer Aide Mrs. Martin to follow in assisting Terry. Should the Aide need further assistance, she will request it, but otherwise she will

be able to complete the activity and relay any message to the teacher either verbally or by leaving written correspondence in the file box.

C. Regulations governing the Volunteer Aide program:

A Volunteer will not be assigned a pupil in the class grouping where her own child is in attendance. She may be assigned to another room within the building.

Part of the initial in-service training period is devoted to a discussion of the student's right to expect confidential treatment in relation to individual learning problems. Individual student problems are not carried beyond the school.

It is important to maintain the established schedule if at all possible, but if it becomes necessary to cancel a session, the school must be notified as early as possible.

General meetings which involve all Volunteer Aides are kept to a minimum because of the difficulty of all Aides to attend at one time. However, at least one mass meeting a year is held to bring all Aides together and offer new information about meeting the needs of disadvantaged students. An additional purpose for this meeting is to express appreciation for the tremendous contribution being made to the education of these students.

Assignments must avoid any initial teaching activity and are to be confined to supportive types of functions.

D. Results of the Volunteer Aide program:

Most Volunteer Aides are better satisfied if they come directly in contact with pupils. assisting them to practice arithmethic and reading as opposed to auxiliary choices of paper checking, mimeographing, etc., although a very few request and are assigned these chores.

Experience has indicated that the service of the Volunteer Teacher Aides is of superior quality, since it is motivated by an intense desire to serve pupils. It has been noted, also, that there is a very low attrition rate among Volunteers and a remarkable devotion to maintaining a constant schedule with the pupil.

IX. Community and parent involvement in Title I programs in Indiana:

A. Title I programs worked with and were supplemented by Federal programs, organized groups, business and industry, and individuals. Outstanding examples of cooperation and involvement were shown by Head Start, Community Action Agencies, Neighborhood Youth Corps, volunteer aides and tutors, and Community Health and Welfare Services.

The SEA has put emphasis on the involvement of various segments of the community, utilizing all the resources such groups have to offer. It may be estimated that at least 95% of Indiana LEA's have community and parental involvement to a greater degree than expressed in their evaluations and applications. This was found to be true when SEA staff members visited schools to see Title I programs in operation.

In the past, parent involvement has consisted mainly of parent-teacher conferences, teachers reporting to the parents, and parents attending open house. There is a definite trend toward changing to more active parent participation. The use of parents may be summarized:

(1) Parents served on planning committees regarding Title I programs.

(2) Parents were used as volunteer aides and tutors.

(3) Parents watched their children participate in class activities.

(4) Parents accompanied their children to speech therapy and special training sessions.

(5) Parents accompanied children on field trips and other cultural enrichment activities.

(6) Extensive home visit programs were conducted by parents, teachers, social workers and nurses.

(7) Parents came into the classroom to demonstrate skills and customs of other cultures, such as glass blowing, wood carving, folk singing and folk dancing, weaving, candlemaking and cheesemaking.

The following are examples of community and parent involvement as described by LEA's.

* * * *

In one Indiana school parents staged a teach-in. For one period each week over a span of several months they used their talents to instruct pupils on the fourth grade level. Results have been exhilerating to both parents and children.

The principal commented, "We are having more parent participation in the school than ever before. The participation does not create troubles--it creates understanding. Parents realize teachers have problems, that their children are not angels."

Children voluntarily gave up the morning recess period to participate in the program, which was carried out at very little expense. The children were given a choice of subjects: woodworking, art, model cars, dramatics, knitting, Latin, German, first aid and sewing. They were taught by parents who had a considerable knowledge and interest in these areas.

There was a quickening of pupil interest in education. As one child expressed it, "Learning is fun."

After each session parents met to discuss their experiences so that through sharing their successes and problems they gained a better understanding of each other, of their children, and of their school community.

* * * *

Business and industry have helped by:

1. hiring handicapped people on a part-time basis:
2. participating in work-study programs:
3. contributing materials and supplies for projects; and
4. contribution of vitamins and preventive medicines (by a pharmaceutical company).

Another approach to education in an Indiana school was made possible through the contributions of Marsh Foodliners, Inc. and Brooks Foods, Inc. The project was federally funded by Title I and through Vocational Education, Disadvantaged and Handicapped programs.

This approach, called "My Store," was designed for those Title I students who find present forms of education dull and unimaginative. Using the old country store concept, "My Store" was, in a sense, a vocational stimulator--a teaching device where students have actually reinforced the basics of the "three R's" by developing a grocery store.

The two businesses mentioned above delivered shelving, displays, paint and all materials needed plus a complete stock of merchandise ranging from soap to macaroni to the target school where this project took place. The students did the work and thus were allowed to create their own learning situations and relate to subject areas in which they were directly involved.

* * * *

One Indiana LEA made good use of an Education Council to help close the school-parent communications gap in Title I schools. There were three divisions of the Education Council representing the elementary school, the middle school and the high school. The members were selected by drawing names from a list of

Title I and other parents who had indicated that . ..lected they would serve on one of the three divisions of the Council.

The purpose of the Education Council was to help inform parents about Title I, along with the objectives and operation of the schools, and to inform school officials of the concerns and questions which these parents had about the various phases of the school programs. The three divisions of the Education Council were scheduled to meet four or five times each year. Each meeting was important and the members knew that 100% attendance was expected.

The school administrators met with the Council. At the first meeting the members were briefed on the overall functioning of the school corporation, on the duties of the various school officials, on school finance, and on Title I and other programs for the coming year.

Later meetings were designed to allow Council members to voice some of their concerns (or those expressed by friends or neighbors) about the operation of the schools, to decide the order of priority of these concerns, and to identify supportive and non-supportive factors in the school system relating to solution of these problems. School administrators worked on high-priority problems with the benefit of the Council's suggestions.

The success of the Education Council of this LEA speaks well for the future of Education Councils as an effective means of involving Title I parents.

* * * *